DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 396 EA 003 309

AUTHOR	House, Ernest R.; And Others
TITLE	The Demonstration Center. An Appraisal of the Illinois Experience.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield. Dept. of Program Planning for the Gifted.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents, *Demonstration Centers, Educational Change, *Educational Innovation, *Evaluation, *Gifted, Models, Policy Formation, *Research and Development Centers
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine and evaluate the form, function, and effectiveness of Illinois demonstration centers established as change agents for the improvement of district programs for gifted children. The evaluation involved an analysis of the centers' policies formulated over an extended time period, the quality of the demonstration programs, and the centers' disseminative effectiveness. Instruments were developed to (1) compare a sample of demonstration classes with regular gifted and nongifted classes, (2) rate centers on the degree of detail provided to explain the program to visitors, and (3) record teacher interviews and visit and postvisit reactions. The paper contends that the centers can be judged successful in achieving the immediate goals of effective dissemination and demonstration on innovative models, but cannot be so judged in the most important goal of convincing local schools to adopt the models. A series of recommendations for improving the centers ccncludes the study. (MLF)

ED047396

1

THE DEMONSTRATION CENTER

an appraisal of the Illinois experience

Ernest R. House
Thomas Kerins
Joe M. Steele

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois

Supported by

The Department of Program Development for Gifted Children

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

EA 003 309

December 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL OF CHANGE 1

II. EVALUATING THE ILLINOIS DEMONSTRATION CENTERS. 6

III. DEMONSTRATION CENTER POLICIES. 11

IV. THE DEMONSTRATION PROCESS. 19

V. THE IMPACT OF DEMONSTRATION. 25

VI. FACTORS LINKED TO ADOPTION 30

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE. 34

VIII. IMPROVING THE DEMONSTRATION CENTERS. 38

BIBLIOGRAPHY 45

LIST OF FIGURES

1. A CLASSIFICATION SCHEMA OF PROCESSES RELATED TO AND NECESSARY FOR CHANGE IN EDUCATION 4

2. SERVICES RECEIVED BY VISITORS 23

3. ATTRITION FROM INTEREST TO ACTION AMONG VISITORS. 25

4. PRINCIPAL FACTORS INFLUENCING DEMONSTRATION CENTER VISITORS . . .31

I. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL OF CHANGE

Dick Woolworth did what everyone else only talks about -- he built a better mousetrap. As president of Woodstream Corporation, a manufacturer of the old kind of trap in which you catch your fingers, Woolworth put his resources into researching the sleeping, eating, and crawling habits of mice and engineered a more humane trap that was much easier to set. A top product designer was hired to make the trap modernistic enough so people would notice the change. The result was a plastic apparatus looking something like a sardine can, constructed so that when the mouse entered an archway he tripped a wire which snapped up from below and choked him to death.

Elated at the invention, the company told dealers about the new trap's efficiency and convenience and flooded the shelves of hardware stores with them -- where they sat for a year. As the *Wall Street Journal* notes, "The world yawned." The company is now doing well again with its old traps. Observers have offered several explanations, among the more astute of which is that "It is women, not mice, who buy mousetraps." To his chagrin, Woolworth's story is being told already in business conventions across the country as a classic example of how not to market a product. (*Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 24, 1970.) The story is also illustrative of the research and development model of change in action.

Of various strategies for educational change, the most favored at higher policy levels in the educational establishment is the research

and development model. In its simplest form the model envisions the development of an innovation under scientific control and its diffusion into an operating situation. The total change process is conceptualized into a sequence of activities such as "basic research," "applied research," "development," "production," and "packaging." According to Havelock (1969), this model presupposes a "user population" influenced by a process of dissemination which is preceeded by an extensive period of research and development.

Five major features characterize such models:

1) There is a rational sequence of activities which moves from research to development to packaging.
2) Planning must occur on a large scale.
3) A division of labor separates roles and functions in the overall process.
4) A passive consumer awaits acceptance of the innovation if it is delivered properly.
5) A high initial development cost is necessary to eventual success.

Essentially the R & D model views change from the perspective of change agents or global planners. Many prototypes exist. In education the most highly developed model is that of Clark and Guba (1965). The Clark-Guba model analyzes educational change into four major stages: research, development, diffusion, and adoption. The purpose of "research" is to advance knowledge which may serve as the basis for development; the purpose of "development" to invent and build a solution to an operating problem; the purpose of "diffusion" to introduce the innovation to practitioners; and the purpose of "adoption" to incorporate the innovation into the target system. Each stage is further refined. (See Figure 1.)

The logical appeal of such models has proved irresistible. In 1963 the State of Illinois launched a categorical gifted program which in its architecture approximated this type of model. The Illinois Plan consisted of a set of coordinated activities including development of an innovation, its dissemination and eventual adoption by a local district. At the end of the sequence was a passive consumer who could be persuaded to adopt the innovation. Specific roles (experimentors, developers, demonstration directors, and reimbursement directors) were assigned responsibility for various functions of the process and the total sequence was supervised by a state staff. Over a six year period about $30 million dollars were spent on the whole operation.

In its final form the Illinois Plan consisted of five complementary approaches to improving local programs for the gifted: 1) partial reimbursement to local schools for the extra costs of operating programs for the gifted; 2) establishment of approximately twenty regional demonstration centers to provide operating models of various approaches to the education of gifted children; 3) state support of experimental projects to advance knowledge of education for the gifted; 4) establishment of a small state staff to coordinate the entire program and to render consultant services; 5) the creation of several training programs, including summer institutes and in-service workshops, to increase the number of specially trained personnel who could work in the gifted programs.

At the center of the Illinois Plan were the demonstration centers, serving as the main instruments of change and the repository of major hopes and resources.

FIGURE: 1 A CLASSIFICATION SCHEMA OF PROCESSES RELATED TO AND NECESSARY FOR CHANGE IN EDUCATION

	RESEARCH	DEVELOPMENT		DIFFUSION *		ADOPTION		
		INVENTION	DESIGN	DISSEMINATION	DEMONSTRATION	TRIAL	INSTALLATION	INSTITUTIONALIZATION
OBJECTIVE	To advance knowledge	To formulate a new solution to an operating problem or to a class of operating problems, i.e., to innovate	To order and to systematize the components of the invented solution; to construct an innovation package for institutional use, i.e., to engineer	To create widespread awareness of the invention among practitioners, i.e., to inform	To afford an opportunity to examine and assess operating qualities of the invention, i.e., to build conviction	To build familiarity with the invention and provide a basis for assessing the quality, value, fit, and utility of the invention in a particular institution, i.e., to test	To fit the characteristics of the invention to the characteristics of the adopting institution, i.e., to operationalize	To assimilate the invention as an integral and accepted component of the system, i.e., to establish
CRITERIA	Validity (internal and external)	Face Validity (appropriateness) --- Estimated Viability --- Impact (relative contribution)	Institutional Feasibility --- Generalizability --- Performance	Intelligibility --- Fidelity --- Pervasiveness --- Impact (extent to which it affects key targets)	Credibility --- Convenience --- Evidential Assessment	Adaptability --- Feasibility --- Action	Effectiveness --- Efficiency ---	Continuity --- Valuation --- Support
RELATION TO CHANGE	Provides basis for invention	Produces the invention	Engineers and packages the invention	Informs about the invention	Builds conviction about the invention	Tries out the invention in the context of a particular situation	Operationalizes the invention for use in a specific institution	Establishes the invention as a part of an ongoing program; converts it to a "non-innovation"

*The area enclosed by dashes represents the intended role of demonstration centers in the Illinois plan.

> "The purpose of the Illinois Plan for Program Development for Gifted Children is to assist and encourage local school districts to initiate and to improve educational programs for gifted children. The Illinois Plan includes demonstration centers which are intended: first, to provide for Illinois educators and other citizens, convincing and readily accessible demonstrations in operating situations of a number of approaches to the evaluation of gifted children; and second, to help schools which are similar in characteristics or geographically near to develop their own programs" Colton (1968b)

The demonstration idea itself was not new; teaching methods and materials had long been demonstrated to pre-service and in-service teachers, and laboratory schools were usually justified in terms of their demonstration function. The idea that demonstration centers would be sponsored by the state was somewhat unique although previously suggested by Brickell (1961). What was new was that the proposed demonstration centers in the Illinois Plan were to be created by the state in ordinary school systems. By 1969 there were 23 such centers operating with combined budgets over $1,000,000.

The purpose of this paper is to thoroughly examine the form, function, and effectiveness of the demonstration center, and in so doing to "test" indirectly the research and development model of change. For if Havelock is correct, the essence of the R & D model is in successfully influencing a passive consumer to accept the fruits of science through a dissemination process. Ultimately the success of the demonstration center rests on the viability of the R & D paradigm. In this paper we will contend that demonstration centers are of limited effectiveness in disseminating innovations because of 1) certain policies adopted by the Illinois Plan; 2) lack of proper implementation of other policies by the demonstration center personnel; and 3) the deficiencies of the Research and Development model of change.

II. EVALUATING THE ILLINOIS DEMONSTRATION CENTERS

The purpose of the demonstration centers was never to affect students directly, but rather to affect students indirectly by stimulating local program development in reimbursement centers. An evaluation of the Illinois Demonstration Centers demanded attention to the operation of demonstration and reimbursement centers rather than assessment of student outcomes. Accordingly, this evaluation began with an analysis of the policies that gradually gave form and substance to the Illinois Demonstration Centers. However, since these policies were formulated over an extended time period and communicated in many ways, a first step in the evaluation was to compile these policies from official and unofficial sources. The major categories of demonstration policies and their long-term effects are reported in the next chapter.

A second consideration was the quality of the demonstrated programs. Were the demonstrated programs really superior to regular gifted programs by any objective standards? A specially developed instrument was administered in a sample of demonstration classes and compared to a sample of "regular" gifted classes and non-gifted classes. These results are also reported in the next chapter.

The third and primary consideration of the investigation was to evaluate the disseminative effectiveness of the demonstration centers. Since the centers were based on a model of operation similar to the Clark-Guba diffusion model, it was reasonable to apply the criteria suggested by that model for each appropriate stage of educational change. In the official literature of the centers the operational goals were formalized as follows:

(1) "Awareness: -- Making visitors aware of new programs for the gifted (corresponding to the "dissemination" stage of the Clark-Guba model). The purpose of the "dissemination" stage is to inform about the innovation:

> "It is the purpose of dissemination to create widespread awareness of the inventions among practitioners, that is, to inform or tell practitioners about the performance and process aspects of the invention. The criteria which are appropriate for the evaluation of dissemination activities include intelligibility (is the message clear?), fidelity (does the message give a valid picture?), pervasiveness (does the message reach its intended audience?), and impact (does the message affect key targets.) The essential activities of dissemination are reporting and interpreting; these activities perform the function of informing about the innovation." (Guba, 1966)

(2) "Acceptance" -- Convincing visitors to accept the demonstrated programs as good ones (corresponding to the "demonstration" stage of Clark-Guba). The Clark-Guba model's "demonstration" stage affords an opportunity for the target system to examine and assess the operating qualities of the invention, equivalent to what the Illinois Centers call "acceptance":

> "The criteria appropriate to an evaluation of demonstration functions thus seems to me to include credibility (is the demonstration convincing and does it build conviction?), convenience (is the demonstration accessible to those practitioners who ought to see it?) and evidential assessment (does the demonstration illustrate both positive and negative factors related to the invention so that the observer may reach a valid professional judgment about its utility?). The essential activities of demonstration are production and staging, and its purpose is to build well-founded professional conviction in relation to the innovation." (Guba, 1966)

(3) "Implementation" -- Getting visitors to adopt the new programs (corresponding to the "trial adoption" stage of Clark-Guba). As one of their main goals, the Illinois demonstration centers also established "adoption" or getting the target population to try out the innovation. This formulation conforms to what Clark and Guba call the "trial" stage of adoption. In this phase, the appropriate criteria include:

How "adaptable" is the innovation to the local scene?

How "feasible" is it in the local setting?

How does the innovation "act" in this setting?

Thus, the Illinois Demonstration Centers operate in the middle three stages of the Clark-Guba change model: dissemination, demonstration, and trial adoption.

Using criteria from the Clark-Guba model as a guide, the following instruments were developed:

(1) Observation Schedule

To help assess the dissemination stage, a 41-item instrument on which observers rated the degree of detail provided in the a) explanation of the program; b) explanation of the class to be observed; c) observation of the demonstration class; d) explanation of the center's own evaluation; e) explanation of program feasibility was developed. Ratings were made on a four point scale from "Detailed" to "None".

Items were generated by considering what things occurred at a demonstration. Operational definitions were developed for each item. Four observers field-tested both the instrument and procedures for its use at eight different centers before applying it to the entire population. Reliability indicated by the coefficient of observer agreement for all observations was .75. Observers achieved 93% agreement within one scale point (House, et al 1969).

(2) Visitor Questionnaire

To assess the demonstration stage, it was deemed desirable to have an instrument which would tap the visitors' perceptions at the end of the demonstration day. The intent of this instrument was to determine the perceived credibility and acceptance of the demonstration program

immediately after the demonstration while the visitors were still at the center.

The first section consisted of twenty-four items which probed the visibility, procedures, and obtrusiveness of the demonstration; the practical feasibility of the demonstrated program; the similarity of the demonstration district to the visitor's district; and attitude change during demonstration. The second section of the questionnaire used a semantic differential consisting of 30 bi-polar scales which had been factor-analyzed into the following factors: Motivational Qualities, Subject-Matter Value, Ease of Implementation, and Economic Feasibility. Visitors were asked to rate the demonstrated program on these scales.

The visitor questionnaire was field-tested on 60 visitors at eight centers at the same time as the Observation Schedule and was administered at all centers over a two month period; the total number of visitors responding was almost 700 teachers and administrators. (Kerins, et al 1969).

(3) Post Visit Questionnaire

The intent of this questionnaire was to determine what visitors had actually tried to use as a result of their visit (the adoption stage) and their reasons for accepting or rejecting what they had seen at the demonstration centers. The most important item in the questionnaire asked respondents to relate a concrete, specific example of something they had done as a result of their visit to a particular center. This item was then scored as to acceptable specificity by a panel of judges. The questionnaire also had an item based on Rogers' (1964) reasons for adoption, asking why they had adopted a certain activity. Another item was based on Eicholz's (1963) reasons for rejection. This questionnaire was then sent to all those who had completed the Visitor Questionnaire plus a

sample of visitors from the previous year of demonstration. The sample was randomly divided so that some questionnaires were mailed two, four, eight, and twelve months after the visit. A little over 1200 or 60% of the questionnaires were returned.

(4) Interview

Interviews with teachers were conducted in a stratified random sample of schools in the Illinois Program, the target schools for the demonstration centers. Some teachers had been to demonstration centers, some had not. As part of an hour-long structured interview, teachers of gifted students in these schools were asked who and what had influenced their current program. No specific reference was made to demonstration centers in the interview. The interview replies were then scored as to whether demonstration personnel or visits were mentioned. The intent of this measure was to assess the long-term and lasting impact on the diverse target groups of local districts that the demonstration centers were supposed to influence, since the influence could have occurred over a five-year time period. All these data are reported in Chapter IV and Chapter V.

The final data analysis extracted those factors that explain most of the adoption variables. Essentially this entailed factor analyzing the visitor and post-visit questionnaires and relating these factors to the criterion variable of adoption in a step-wise multiple correlation analysis. These data are reported in Chapter VI.

Throughout the paper findings from related studies on the same demonstration centers are used to confirm and explain their operation. In Chapter VII, the meaning of this study within the research and development model of change is discussed. Finally, based on the dynamics discovered here, ways of improving dissemination operations are reported in Chapter VIII.

III. DEMONSTRATION CENTER POLICIES

POLICY MAKERS

In the following chapter, policy is defined as a course of action prescribed by the state and intended to govern the actions of local demonstration personnel (Colton, 1968b). The legislation that created the Illinois Plan provided for the creation of an unpaid, appointive advisory council as policy-makers. The device of an advisory council not only maintained the tradition of limiting the discretion of the State Superintendent; it also provided an alternative to the detailed statutory prescriptions which characterize special educational programs and which often offend many school men. "The Advisory Council could draw upon the latest scientific information without having to go through the legislative process to change rules and criteria of the program." (Colton, 1968a)

The Advisory Council's main task was policy development. As a more objective party (compared to the daily personal involvement of the state staff) the Council has been in a position to look at the long range effects of policy and has had a significantly positive effect during the maturation of the Plan in general and the demonstration centers in particular. Many of its policies have proved to be wise. However, since it meets only a few times during the year it is highly dependent upon the advice and assistance of the state staff which has not been set up as either an evaluation or planning agency. Because the Council meets

irregularly and does not have a great deal of information to work with, policies are sometimes inconsistent and not based on the most recent data. It is also difficult to see that policies are implemented as intended. All in all, while not perfect, the Advisory Council system has worked fairly well.

MAIN POLICIES

Policies have been divided into the four major areas of Colton's summary of the policies of the Illinois Plan: 1) General Purpose of the Centers; 2) Program Management [Role of the Demonstration Director]; 3) Characteristics of Demonstration Programs; and 4) Demonstration Procedures.

General Purpose of the Centers

Over time the purpose of the centers has changed as disseminating innovations appeared more difficult. The original purpose of the centers in 1963 was to provide a realistic setting for displaying exemplary programs. Solicited teachers and administrators observed the demonstration program; it was assumed they would return to their schools to install the programs in their own classes and schools. By May 1965 it had become apparent that visitors were not adopting whole programs.

The state office then insisted that the demonstration centers do more than inform visitors about the efficacy of their demonstrations. The state encouraged the demonstration directors not only to continue their efforts of making their visitors aware of the programs and of accepting the programs psychologically, but also to help former visitors develop

programs for the gifted in their own schools. In other words, the directors would be responsible for helping out school personnel from neighboring reimbursement schools. (Evidently, this policy was not unanimous, since a statement included in the minutes of an Advisory Council meeting (Sept., 1965) indicated that "Services of a director to another district should be limited to providing information and creating awareness.").

However, by 1967 there was little official doubt that"...the purpose of the Illinois Plan for Program Development for Gifted Children is to assist and encourage local school districts to initiate and to improve educational programs for gifted children...demonstration centers are to help schools which are similar in characteristics or geographically near to develop their own programs." The wisdom of this shift is now apparent. "Follow-up" (helping the visitors in their home district) has proved to be the main variable associated with administrators adopting new activities.

Closely associated was another event. Originally the centers were to put themselves out of business after a few years by disseminating their programs. As with most change agencies, this did not happen. Instead, the centers persevered, (having experience, expertise, personal contacts and inside information) and the directors themselves developed into a cohesive and powerful group nearly equal in policy determination with the state staff and Advisory Council. The group cohesiveness was instrumental in establishing the centers during the difficult initiating period. This "grass roots" influence also made local needs strongly felt and made changing the function of the centers very difficult.

Role of the Directors

The role of the demonstration directors paralleled the history of the demonstration center. Early in the program it had been established that demonstration directors, to be effective at all, had to work on a full time basis and could not be coaches or teachers for part of the day. The next question was whether these directors would remain under local authority while performing services for the state. Since the program was still in its infancy and one of the guiding principles was to maintain local control at all times so as to cooperate with local school officials, the directors were selected by the superintendent and remained as local employees subject to the rules of the district.

Although perhaps necessary to the establishment of each center, the long-range impact was to seriously impair the effectiveness of the centers. The directors viewed their career orientation as lying within the local district, not with the state. (House, 1967). Superintendents were inclined to view the centers as public relation ploys and the behavior of the director was determined accordingly. Even though the state insisted on each director being in the field one third of his time, none did so.

The more experience he received as a demonstration director, the more he tended toward a generalist, public relations role with publicity as a goal and away from a technical specialist role with follow-up the goal. For the director, the latter role did not pay off. Since "follow-up" is most clearly associated with adoption, the damage has been great. In spite of rigorous attempts, the state has not been able to remedy this basic defect -- due to the local control policy and the influence of the directors as a group.

Closely related to this policy has been the high cost of demonstration due to almost prohibitive overhead costs. For example, for the 1968-69 school year the average cost of demonstration was $145 for every visitor ($826 for each visitor who tried out an observed activity in his own school). The latter costs are comparable to money spent training a person in a six week summer institute.

Demonstration Programs

Generally the policies for demonstrating quality programs have been quite successful. The emphasis among the early demonstration programs was on curriculum materials developed at the University of Illinois, but gradually the emphasis began to be placed more on teaching strategies and locally developed curriculum projects. Criteria for these programs were that they be internally consistent, socially significant, educationally significant, and that they have unique identification procedures, a trained staff, and a supportive environment. Most of these criteria were well met.

To test the quality of these programs, a low-inference, student judgment instrument was developed and used in assessing cognitive and affective emphases. A sample of demonstration classes was superior to a sample of "regular" gifted classes and a group of "average" classes in "classroom focus" -- active student involvement in class activities with reduced pressure on tests and grades (Steele et al, 1970). This dimension has been most emphasized in the selection and training of demonstration personnel. Of the four dimensions classroom focus is the easiest to make visible to visitors. On the other three dimensions of the instrument -- lower level thinking abilities, higher level thinking abilities, and positive classroom climate -- there were no differences between demonstration and reimbursement gifted classes. (Both samples of gifted classes were superior

to the average classes sampled. In addition, demonstration visitors were highly impressed by the programs. They saw them as highly motivating and academically valuable, relevant to visitor needs, and appropriate for a gifted student population (Kerins, et al, 1970).

Concurrent with the War on Poverty, the state in 1965 declared that the demonstration centers should develop programs which would deal with "socially significant educational problems." Areas suggested included racial problems, hallucinogenic drugs, drop-outs, loss of creative talent and emotional disturbance. Little has been done by the centers in those areas.

It has also been suggested that demonstration programs concentrate on gifted youth from socially and culturally underprivileged groups as well as underachievers. These students have received only slight attention, and nearly all of it in the Chicago area. As with Title I and other such attempts, these programs have been less than a booming success. The programs serve almost exclusively pupils "whose mental development is accelerated to the extent that they need and can profit from the program."

Another basic policy has been the requirement for continual research and evaluation. One of the reasons for founding the centers was to provide a medium where research could be quickly illustrated and delivered to the consumer: the school teacher and administrator. For this reason it was required that "programs being demonstrated should be able to show application of research findings beyond the typical subjective evidence." By this was meant that scientific opinion was desired and not solely the opinion of the teacher down the hall. Each demonstration center was to supply"...data for measuring learning outcomes or student growth in such areas as values, kinds of thinking, or self direction." Some centers did attempt to evaluate

their programs in these terms, but the policy was not enforced so many centers did not seriously evaluate. Those centers that did research their programs rarely notified the visitors that the results were available.

The criterion policy for the demonstration centers was "exportability." "The significant elements of the program must hold good promise for adaptation or adoption by schools which the center is to serve." The only way this policy could be accurately judged was to examine the schools serviced by the demonstration centers and see if the demonstrations had indeed inspired any action on the part of the visitors. In other words, had the centers gone beyond the level of intellectual awareness and psychological acceptance to actual physical implementation of a curriculum or teaching strategy? The following chapters will illustrate that there is a great difference between demonstrating a promising program and actual implementation in reimbursement classrooms.

Demonstration Procedures

The policies on demonstration procedures closely paralleled the operational goals of the centers. The policies spelled out ways of soliciting visitors, making visitors aware of the program, providing services to the visitors' schools, and evaluating and improving the demonstration procedures.

In soliciting visitors the centers have been enormously successful. Combined they drew 6,000 visitors in 1968-69 (including 3,500 teachers and administrators). In a way this was a mixed blessing since the directors were sometimes so busy showing visitors around that they neglected other services. Each demonstration center had been continually urged"...to attract visitors in sufficient numbers to justify the cost of demonstration." At the same time the centers had been urged "...not to secure visitors but effect better programs for capable children in other schools." The response to this

dilemma was predictable; it was easier and politically safer for the demonstration directors to report numbers of visitors to the state staff and Advisory Council with the implication that these visitors were highly satisfied and inclined to import the demonstration programs or ideas into their own districts.

In evaluating their own demonstration procedures, the findings of the centers were that the visitors were highly satisfied and that they felt inclined to import some aspect of a program. This was an honest finding derived from the visitors' immediate reactions. The problem was that this reaction was a spurious index of visitor behavior. Visitors were extremely positive about future actions while still at the center but their ultimate actions were often severely limited once they returned to the social, economic, and political realities of their own school. Perhaps as the Advisory Council has advocated, "Changes in a reimbursed program should be a measure of the effectiveness of a demonstration center as a sales agent."

All in all, in making visitors aware of the program and getting them to accept it, the policies pursued by the centers have been highly successful. Policies such as letting visitors talk to teachers and students have paid off. Unfortunately, these actions were not sufficient to insure adoption in and of themselves. The directors have also provided a number of services to visitors, such as training institutes and workshops. The one major exception, as mentioned previously, is that "follow-up" has not taken place to the extent desired. And it is this service that is linked to adoption. (Kerins, et al 1970).

IV. THE DEMONSTRATION PROCESS

PRE DEMONSTRATION

Each center mailed several hundred brochures to schools throughout the state explaining the type of programs it demonstrated and at what grade levels. While the grade level varied from 1st to 12th grade, the variety of demonstrated activities ranged from music and creativity programs to Individually Prescribed Instruction and from team teaching to "new curricula."

During the 1968-69 school year, over 3,000 teachers, the majority of whom were female elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms, observed demonstrations. These teachers were well educated (32% had at least their Master's), recently educated (59% reached their highest level of education within the last five years), and experienced (50% had at least 10 years of teaching experience). Over 500 administrators, generally male principals, also observed demonstrations at the centers.

Funds from the reimbursement phase of the Illinois Plan financed these teachers and administrators on visits to demonstration centers. At the time of the visit, a quarter of the teachers and half of the administrators were directly involved with ongoing gifted programs in their districts. The other visitors were either in the planning stages of a gifted program or were personnel who visited because they were curious.

Teachers and administrators generally agreed on reasons for visits. Although curiosity was a major factor for both groups, 40% of the teachers and 32% of the administrators came to a particular center with the idea that they wanted to make a change in their classes or schools. Therefore, it is

obvious that a significant number of the visitors were self-selected to the extent that they had more than an open mind toward change; they were ready and eager for it. In fact, 34% of the visitors were already highly interested in using the activities before visiting the center and 8% had already decided to do so.

Part of the traditional demonstration process has always been to initiate visitors to the day's activities during an orientation session. Over coffee and rolls the demonstration center director might acquaint the visitors with the nature of the program which would be observed while later the demonstration teachers related the essence of the specific classes they taught that day.

Generally, the centers did explain overall program objectives and treatments, but did not explain how the demonstration teachers were selected and trained. To a lesser extent the center personnel explained specific class objectives and specific treatments but they failed to discuss any particular characteristics of the class, such as its academic progress. It should be noted that a few centers failed to give any information at all to the visitors except for an extremely sketchy outline of the day's activities.

The Demonstration

After the orientation the visitors expected to see from one to four classes in perhaps two or three different schools. The evidence suggests that the demonstrations were well done and that the content of the classes was good. The visitors were able to hear and see the class proceedings clearly without disturbing the students. In most cases they observed a high degree of student involvement in class activities, and a great deal

of student and teacher enthusiasm about their particular demonstration classes. The visitors received an opportunity to talk with the teachers and usually with the students who participated in the demonstration classes.

After viewing classes visitors concluded that these demonstration classes were relevant to their needs and 80% of them also stated they would like to incorporate some aspect of a demonstrated activity into their own classes or schools. More specifically, the popular activities among visitors were independent study, some of the special curriculum materials, small group work, team teaching, learning/resource centers, the inquiry method, flexible scheduling, inductive teaching and individualized instruction. Most of these activities could be employed with average as well as gifted children.

It seems logical that the demonstration directors would attempt to impress the visitors with the feasibility of the activities these visitors had just witnessed, since psychological acceptance of the activities is a requirement before actual implementation -- the ultimate goal. However, in most centers problems of future installation of demonstration activities in their own schools were not discussed. For example, the practical problems of the cost, the necessary materials, equipment, or training, and how to obtain all three, were usually not mentioned. Neither did the centers explain their evaluation plans or procedures or results.

Although for over 84% of the visitors there would be only one visit to the center, they were subjected to a fairly standardized processing which did not deal with the particular and personal aspects of their home situations. Visitors were likely to be told quite a bit about the overall program and the classes they were to view but not very much about any evaluation of the program or how to implement it in their district.

For their part visitors felt that they had been very well informed.

When asked about their general reaction toward the demonstration center 94% of the visitors replied with a positive response. In fact, about 33% of all the visitors reported that their attitudes changed during the demonstration day, with the overwhelming change (79%) being from neutral to positive. The visitors usually perceived the demonstrated programs as being different from those in their home districts, appropriate for gifted children, and relevant to their needs. They also saw the demonstrated activities as having high motivational value and academically valuable subject matter.

The vast majority of visitors believed that some of the demonstrated activities were realistic with regard to physical prerequisites in their school personnel, space, facilities, and funds -- even though they perceived the demonstration centers to be higher socio-economically. They saw their schools as being able to handle the innovations.

By the end of the day, in spite of some doubts, the majority of visitors said they were going to attempt to change their classroom behavior (74%) or their curriculum (58%). They were committed to the activities as demonstrated but even more committed to the ideal educational philosophies underlying the demonstrations. In short, they were convinced (many before they came); they liked what they saw and intended adopting many activities to their own situations.

POST DEMONSTRATION

There were two types of follow-up given to the visitors: passive and active. Passive follow-up is defined as sending materials to past

visitors and making presentations to groups of school personnel. Active follow-up is defined as a person-to-person working relationship involving the visitor and a member of the demonstration staff.

The figure below illustrates the range and type of follow-up visiting school personnel received.

FIGURE 2 SERVICES RECEIVED BY VISITORS

		Teachers	Administrators
PASSIVE FOLLOW-UP	Receive Materials	21%*	26%
	Receive Presentation	8%	15%
ACTIVE FOLLOW-UP	Receive Training	5%	12%
	Receive Help in Starting a Program	5%	11%
	Receive Assistance With Student Selection Procedures	3%	8%
	Receive Help in Developing Lesson Plans	4%	3%
	Receive Assistance With Curriculum Development	4%	4%

*A visitor could respond to all items; therefore, the potential response for each category is 100%.

A large percentage of the visitors to the Illinois Demonstration Centers received no help. Visitors who did get help in most cases received passive follow-up, although visitors who asked for follow-up usually got it. For the most part demonstration directors passively waited for visitors to initiate requests for particular assistance.

There were individual centers that attempted a more thorough follow-up than others. However, the variation did not seem great, thereby suggesting

that part of the problem lay within the total structure and not just with personnel from a few centers.

In summary, the state policy-makers encouraged the use of follow-up to overcome the problem of demonstrating in what is often perceived as an atypical situation. The follow-up has not been as frequent nor as penetrating (speeches and materials) as policies demanded. For example, 10% or more of the visitors in 17 or the 20 centers received mailed materials. However 10% or more visitors in only 5 of the 20 centers received help in developing their own programs. Similarly the centers did not stress the practical matters of how visitors may adopt activities. Neither did centers provide the "evidential assessment" the Clark-Guba model calls for. For their part the visitors did not seem to miss these ommissions. They felt that they were well informed and left with what could be described as a euphoric feeling.

V. THE IMPACT OF DEMONSTRATION

Implementation

After periods ranging from two months to one year since their visit, the great majority (79%) of visitors were still favorably impressed by the demonstrations and said they saw some activities they would like to implement at home. The activities most often mentioned were independent study, individualized instruction, and team teaching. Somewhat fewer (46%) said they had started incorporating changes.

The criterion item, however, asked respondents to relate a specific, critical incident of how their behavior had changed as a result of their visit. A panel of three judges independently scored the written comments according to a carefully defined protocol. Being able to give a specific example was considered the best indicator of the short-range impact of the demonstration center. About 29% of the 1100 teachers and administrators in the sample were able to supply a concrete example of behavior change. (Note that this example, which we label "adoption," may be indicative of only a one-time trial).

FIGURE 3 ATTRITION FROM INTEREST TO ACTION AMONG VISITORS

	Teacher	Administrator	Total*
Would like to use activities	78%	82%	79%
Have decided to accept and use activities	59%	53%	58%
Have started incorporating changes	46%	46%	46%
Can give an acceptably specific example of change	30%	25%	29%

*Since the teachers' responses outnumber the administrators' responses by more than five to one, the total % is closer to the teacher% than to the administrator %.

The length of time between visiting the demonstration center and filling out the questionnaire seemed to make no difference for administrators. However, those teachers who filled out the questionnaire 4 months after the visit had higher adoption ratios than those eight months after the visit. Also, those who received the questionnaires in the spring indicated a significantly higher degree of adoption than those who received them in the fall.

The overall adoption ratio of 29% for all twenty centers is consistent with an earlier study of two centers which found a 19% ratio (House, 1966). (The earlier study used a stricter scoring protocol that eliminated all responses not directly employing the subject matter demonstrated.)

Among the twenty centers investigated here the percent of visitors indicating trial adoption ranged from 14% to 55%. Two centers had adoption ratios of 50% while three had less than 20%. The number of visitors received and the number affected are independent of each other. For example:

1) Some centers affected a comparatively high proportion of visitors even though they had a large number of visitors;
2) Some centers affected a high proportion but did not handle a large number of visitors (perhaps because of the nature of their demonstrations or their physical setting);
3) Some centers affected a comparatively large number of visitors simply because of the large number of visiting school personnel; the proportion of visitors affected was low;
4) Some centers apparently had very little going for them -- affecting only a few of the small number of visitors to their centers.

A standard of 100% success is an entirely unrealistic expectation for change programs. In social institutions resistance to change is strong.

The adoption of innovations in 25% of the contacts made is no mean accomplishment while a rate of 50% adoption would represent an extremely high degree of success. As a total group, the Illinois Centers affected 29% of their visitors -- a highly respectable figure. Of 3500 school personnel visiting, about 1000 tried out at least one new thing. In getting people to try out things the centers must be judged a success. There are, however, some important qualifications. First, the population visiting the demonstration centers was strongly self-selected -- many wanted to change before they came. The 29% who did try something new are a percentage of people already committed to change, not of the total educator population, which is often considered to be rather recalcitrant. The results are a little like giving a test solely to one's better students.

The most important question though is the depth and duration of the change. Simply trying out something new one time is not far-reaching change. In structured interviews in 34 target reimbursement districts (a 10% random sample), teachers of the gifted were asked who and what had influenced their program. No specific reference was made to demonstration centers. Teachers in 10% of the districts attributed substantial influence in the development of their programs to help from demonstration center personnel though not to visits to demonstration centers. This figure represents a cumulative impact over several years in the target population.

In addition, when the quality of gifted programs in these districts was related to other variables, there was no relationship between quality of program and visits to demonstration centers or visits from demonstration personnel. There were small but significant relationships with visits from university consultants and from state staff members. These findings are consistent with Erlandson's (1969) survey of 202 reimbursement directors which found that demonstration directors were not influential in local re-

imbursement decision-making but that state consultants were.

Finally only about 2% of the target reimbursement districts had adopted a demonstrated program in toto -- the original goal of the centers. In fact, little evidence was found of earlier demonstration programs such as "new math", even in some districts that had been field test sites. At best, districts seldom adopted new programs from demonstration centers, although some attempted to. What resulted was a patchwork of partial adoptions which extended neither to all grades, subjects, or schools in a district nor to all classes within a grade, subject area or school. Changes directly attributable to the demonstration centers tended to be not very far-reaching.

Reasons for Acceptance and Rejection

In order to discover the reasons teachers and administrators accepted certain innovative activities in their schools instead of others, a checklist was developed from Rogers' (1964) framework of characteristics of innovations. The five characteristics were relative advantage, compatibility, complexibility, divisibility, and communicability.

The one main characteristic which influenced visitors to accept an activity and adopt it into their own school situation was divisibility. By "divisibility" is meant that the activities can be used on a limited basis or that parts can be used without necessarily adopting the entire activity. Many individuals were willing to accept something new only if it appeared possible to integrate it into their present system.

It was assumed that there would be an attrition rate between wanting to implement an activity and actual implementation. The question, therefore, was asked whether visitors would like to use an activity but were unable to. A total of 54% of these school personnel believed they were

unable to use at least one of the observed activities. Each one of the respondents indicated his reasons by checking off as many of the sixteen items as he considered applicable. The items were based on Eichol:'s (1963) framework for the identification of forms of rejection. Visitors believed that a lack of money and facilities, complex schedule changes, and a shortage of staff kept them from using the activities. These data support the contention that often

> "The uniqueness of a demonstration makes it suspect and not at all compelling to the observer. The demonstration presents something that can be done given a highly unusual set of conditions --it is rigged, so to speak. It neglects to demonstrate to the observer what he can do about the factors in his situation which are different from those in the demonstration setting. The demonstration assumes that rational factors are the only factors to be considered, but the observer knows or should know that there are economic, political, social and other factors involved in bringing about the same change in his system or context. The factors, which are probably the major barriers to change, are not dealt with in the demonstration setting. Demonstrations present the "what" aspects of change and few or none of the "how" aspects. The observer is presented with a *fait accompli* and he gets none of the information regarding how it was brought off." (Horvat 1967)

VI. MAIN FACTORS LEADING TO ADOPTION

What factors operated within the demonstration process to influence a visitor to adopt activities he had seen demonstrated? To answer this question data were related to whether an individual adopted a demonstrated activity from a center. (The verbal information and explanation conveyed by the demonstration directors seemed to have little relationship to later adoption.)

A principal components analysis was performed on the responses of the 600 teachers and 88 administrators who completed the visitor questionnaire at the demonstration center and the 907 teachers and 186 administrators who completed the post visit questionnaire. Six factors for teachers and six for administrators were extracted from each questionnaire. (See Figure 4). These factors were statistically derived clusters of related items in the questionnaire which had been given the most appropriate names for the items they contained.

To find out which of these factors were most important an additional statistical step was taken. After undergoing a varimax rotation, the 12 factors for teachers and 12 for administrators were entered into a stepwise multiple correlation analysis with the criterion variable of adoption: their examples of innovations attempted as a result of the demonstration center visit. (Only visitors who completed both a visitor and post visit questionnaire were used in the analysis. This included 371 teachers and 82 administrators.) This analysis identified seven factors which were the most critical for adoption (accounted for the largest amount of the variance.)

FIGURE 4 PRINCIPAL FACTORS INFLUENCING DEMONSTRATION CENTER VISITORS

VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE				POST VISIT QUESTIONNAIRE			
Administrators		Teachers		Administrators		Teachers	
1. Motivational value of program (socially valuable, enjoyable, motivating)	23%	1. Motivational value of program (socially valuable, enjoyable, motivating)	26%	*1. Personal follow up (see page 23)*	23.3%	*1. Reasons for adoption*	23%
2. Appropriateness of program (appropriate for all, precise)	22%	2. Progressiveness of program (democratic, progressive, humanitarian)	24%	2. Reasons for adopting (see page 28)	21%	2. Personal follow up	21.4%
3. Feasibility (space, funds, personnel available)	14.2%	3. Feasibility (space, funds, personnel available)	14.5%	3. Reasons for rejecting (see page 29)	15.6%	*3. Reasons for rejecting*	18%
4. Ease of implementation (simple, easy to teach and evaluate)	14%	4. Ease of implementation (simple, easy to teach and evaluate)	13%	4. Gifted program involvement	14.6%	*4. Subject and grade level taught*	14.2%
5. ***Prima Facie evidence of operational program (enthusiasm by teachers and pupils, cost discussed)*	13.5%	5. Prima Facie evidence of operational program (able to talk with teachers; students, given information)	12.5%	*5. Age and experience*	13.3%	5. Gifted program involvement	12%
6. Relevance of program (morally, socially valuable, requires reasoning, socially oriented)	13.3%	6. Feasibility explained (cost discussed, how to get materials explained)	10%	*6. Material follow up (received lesson plans and other materials)*	12.2%	6. Age and experience	11.4%
	100%		100%		100%		100%

*Percentage of variance accounted for among these particular 6 factors
**These factors in italics are the most critical for adoption.

These appear in italics in Figure 4.

The four factors that pertain to administrators were:

Administrators	% Variance Accounted For
Personal Follow-up	17%
Prima Facie Evidence of Operationability	6
Materials Follow-up	4
Age and Experience	3
	30%

The most critical factors for teachers were:

Teachers	% Variance Accounted For
Reasons for Adopting	18%
Subject and Grade Level Taught	2
Reasons for Rejecting	1
	21%

For administrators the main factors associated with adopting an activity from a demonstration center were follow-up help from the center and the administrators' judgment (based on enthusiastic teachers and students) of how well the program worked. This follow-up was of two kinds -- passive or active. Active follow-up was far more improtant than simply the sending of material. Together the two kinds of follow-up comprised two-thirds of the explained variance. The younger and less experienced administrators were also more likely to adopt an activity, a well-documented phenomenon.

Of little importance were the perceived "motivational value," "appropriateness," "worthiness" of the program or the perceived ease of

implementation, feasibility, reasons for adopting or rejecting, or involvement with the home program, although it may be that a program was rejected on that basis. The perceptions of intrinsic merits of the demonstration program were less important than the availability of outside help.

For the teachers the important variables were even fewer. The overwhelming one was the reason for adoption -- time spent would be well used; able to adapt parts; administrators would accept change; enough facilities available; cooperation from other teachers could be obtained. Most of these reasons concerned how well the new activity fitted into the structure of the teacher's world. Of slight importance was the subject area and grade level of the teacher. Science and high school teachers were more likely to try out an activity than language arts and elementary teachers. Again the factors indicating intrinsic evaluation of the demonstrated program were not important. In this case not enough follow-up from the demonstration centers occurred to judge its importance for teachers. *The fact that visitors valued the demonstration programs highly had little relationship with later adoption. Situational constraints in the adopting district seem to be of greater importance than the intrinsic characteristics of the demonstrated program or the process of demonstration itself.*

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

The Illinois centers must be judged successful at the immediate goals of awareness (dissemination) and acceptance (demonstration) but not at the ultimate and most important goal of implementation (adoption). This ineffectiveness of the centers can be subsumed under two topics -- the execution of the plan and the deficiency of the change model itself.

It is clear that in important ways the plan was not executed as originally intended. In particular there was little evidential assessment of the demonstration programs nor was the feasibility of adopting demonstrated activities emphasized in most centers. Most importantly, the amount of follow-up (shown to be the main variable related to administrator adoption) was far less than that prescribed by the state. The policy of placing demonstration centers under local control severely damaged the centers' accountability to the state. Also the centers became unduly expensive institutions to operate because of the overhead costs involved in supporting these local bastions.

The effectiveness of the demonstration centers could be greatly improved by a reorganization such as that suggested in the next chapter. The main problem is to make the centers responsive to the problems of adoption. Making the demonstration centers accountable for executing their duties properly is a monumental task, as it is with any organization.

Of equal importance to the success of the centers, however, is the model of operation on which they are predicated -- the Research and Development model of change. Judged entirely in terms of the Clark-Guba model the centers must be regarded a success because they meet most of the criteria of

of that model. In short, visitors were informed and were convinced that the programs they saw operating were worth adopting. It should follow that visitors would adopt the programs -- but most did not. That follow-up should be more important to adoption than the nature of the demonstrated program suggests something seriously wrong with the model itself.

If Havelock is correct, Research and Development models of change assume a passive user population which is shaped by the dissemination process itself. The facts belie this assumption. Of far greater importance are the variables controlling the would-be adopters everyday world in his home district. The individual is caught in a powerful social web that determines his behavior more than do his individual impressions gleaned at a demonstration visit. The variables that influence whether he will adopt are those that shape this home environment. The findings in this study are consistent with the "social interaction" change model which sees change as a result of the social relations network within the adopting unit. As Havelock notes, only this change model has substantial empirical verification.

The Research and Development model proffers the promise that if one can only invent the right packages and disseminate them in the right way, change will occur. It focuses attention away from the complexities of changing a social system toward the simpler and more comfortable problem of inventing a new device -- building a better mousetrap. As exemplified by the Illinois centers, the Research and Development model can produce change but only small scale change at considerable cost, change only in the interstices of the system that leaves the total structure unaffected.

As with any model, the Research and Development model is not entirely wrong; it simply attracts attention to the wrong variables. Concentrating on engineering the invention lulls us into seeing the consumer as a *tabula*

rasa. He is not. Acting on it prompts us to establish change agents to feed products to practitioners. It does not work well.

In reinforcing the social interaction model of change we will go one step further by suggesting the kind of social dynamic from which change is derived. In a related study investigating the development of educational programs, the data seemed to be most appropriately explained by an "advocate" model (House et al 1970). If a school district is seen as a set of groups contending for scarce resources, the development of a program depends on establishing its vested interest. This change can be most easily envisioned as organized around one person who selects program members and infuses them with appropriate values. The advocate's job is to establish and defend the integrity and identity of the program.

The relevant variables are political and sociological; the milieu is conflict. The clash of opposing interests results in the system being changed. For large scale change to occur, such as the adoption of a whole new program, both resources and values must be reallocated within the system. The social system itself must change. Attempts to introduce innovations into districts without the appropriate dynamics result in adoption of bits and pieces that fit within the interlockings of the existing system.

Visits to demonstration centers and visits from university consultants may offer useful alternatives but they are influential only insofar as they increase the strength of the advocate within the system. The main variables are the opinion leadership of the advocate, norms of the district toward the program, and the resources allocated in favor of the program. In large-scale change the innovation is transmuted in the process of installing it. What results is not the same as what was intended.

Ultimately the change paradigms rest on one's conception of the school

as an organization. The Research and Development paradigm is essentially an engineering model which sees the organization as composed of standard building blocks which can be replaced with superior ones. From this engineering view there are not enough good parts around, so it is the duty of demonstration centers and regional labs to manufacture more parts that can be sold to the consumer. This view assumes that the adopting organization is an integrated problem-solving mechanism pursuing common goals. It assumes that values and goals are agreed upon and only new means are needed. Consequently, the whole change process is viewed as problem-solving in a consensus society.

In fact, values and goals within schools are hazy and conflicting. They are derived from the interaction of coalitions in and around the school. Where consensus exists, little change is called for. The actual process of change necessitates conflict unless change is restricted to those tiny areas of agreement. Change requires protagonists, and large-scale change a reallocation of resources and values. The Research and Development model may work well in those situations in agriculture or engineering where an economic end is overwhelming but in education where groups of people are involved, the process is more organic.

VIII. IMPROVING THE DEMONSTRATION DENTERS

In the following recommendations we have hypothesized the ideal conditions under which the potential of the present centers could be maximized. The concept of this new institution, which is designated as an Area Service Center (ASC), is not new; it has been mentioned at previous times when recommendations were requested by the Advisory Council and the State Staff. In this chapter we have attempted to elaborate on our prior statements. However, we do not claim that our plan for the metamorphosis of the demonstration centers is a panacea guaranteed to be the final solution to the problems of educational diffusion. Rather the concept of the ASC seems to be the best solution possible given the present structure and limits of the Illinois Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The typical administrative unit of operation found in most demonstration centers must be uniformly changed.

1. Location...The Area Service Centers can be located within a variety of public agencies, such as the offices of a county superintendent, universities, or school districts (including those which have had or presently have demonstration centers). The original rationale required location of the centers within the school district which provided all the demonstration classes. However, since now it is apparent that demonstration should be relegated to the status of a single instrument and not considered the entire orchestra, physical

proximity between the headquarters of the ASC and the demonstrations is not necessary. The total number should be determined by a combination of demographic and geographic factors, but eight to ten centers seems appropriate.

2. Staff Control...The policy of allowing the local school district to control its demonstration center has caused inherent problems which have inhibited the center and its personnel from reaching their full potential. Requiring all ASC staff members to become state employees does not seem to be a satisfactory alternative. Instead, a public agency could act as the financial intermediary receiving money from the state on a contractual basis.

3. Staff Selection...The present staff selection procedure must be broken, i.e., the staff positions in the ASC would not be connected with tenure. Throughout the history of the demonstration centers, personnel have been chosen who see their future career as lying within the local district and not the State Department of Education generally, or the Illinois Gifted Program in particular. Many of these demonstration directors and assistant directors see their position as a temporary stopover on the way to the more prestigious position of principal. This new policy of location will necessitate the choosing of individuals who do not have 10 to 15 years of tenure with a school system and would be reluctant to leave it. Work by the state staff this year indicates that selecting these individuals would not be an overwhelmingly difficult task.

Although the size of the ASC staff would be dependent on location and economic limitations, it should have at least two members. The more staff members available to work with teachers the more effective

each ASC should become in developing local programs. Selected school administrators with specific talents or skills could be hired on a contractual basis for a certain number of school days per year. They could then augment the work of the ASC staff in various activities such as training.

4. Long Range Planning...The problem of not granting tenure to staff members of the ASC could be alieviated if the state and the Advisory Council declared at least a two (and preferably three) year moral committment to the maintenance of each center. This inducement should be helpful in developing a pool of potential applicants. The theme of the ASC operation should be long term planning within its own operation and in its relation to reimbursement schools.

5. Mode of Operation...Each ASC will be particularly responsible for a certain number of reimbursement centers within its artificial boundaries. The staff members, in consultation with the state consultant in the area, would visit the reimbursement schools:

a) To determine the design of the local power structure (to facilitate future work in the school district)

b) To uncover the needs and problems of the reimbursement director and the reimbursement teachers.

c) To discover the classes within the district that may be suitable for demonstration.

This approach is contradictory to the current philosophy behind the demonstration centers (Research & Development Model of Change) which assumes that public school personnel are a vast group of passive consumers eager to be led to an innovation. The lack of long range effects caused by the demonstration centers illustrates the deficiency of this policy.

6. Services...The ASC staff in conjunction with the local personnel would decide on possible alternative approaches to the problems and needs of the reimbursement staff. Here, individual attention is required; not everybody needs to observe demonstrations, receive training, etc. Services should depend on what the reimbursement district needs. If demonstration is suggested, the vast majority would be held in reimbursement schools throughout the area. Arrangements for demonstrations would be made through the local administrators, such as reimbursement directors or building principals. The school district or building would receive compensation from the state for each demonstration held within the district. This arrangement could remove the doubts many visitors presently have about the feasibility of demonstration programs in the ordinary school district.

Whereas at the moment demonstration is all-important and service is quite secondary, the priorities would be reversed in the ASC set-up. The emphasis would clearly be on working with the teachers in the classroom during the development of a gifted program. For example, the ASC staff would work with the teachers for an extended period of time after they had viewed pertinent demonstrations. Also, the effects of various training activities could be analyzed by the ASC staff as they work with the teachers before, during and after a particular type of training.

Another alternative would be the use of a teacher exchange program. Instead of contracting with a district or principal just to use a particular teacher for demonstration pruposes, the ASC

personnel could contract with the teacher for a certain number of days per school year. Some days could be used for demonstrating but other days could also be devoted to working in other reimbursement schools either in a particular classroom or in an in-service training program.

7. State Consultants...These staff members of the OSPI should continue their role as financial advisor to the reimbursement directors. They should personally coordinate the efforts of the personnel at the Area Service Centers in developing programs for gifted students in the reimbursement schools.

8. Funding...The operation of Area Service Centers would be much more economical than is the present operation. For example, several centers presently have limited appeal due to the subject matter they demonstrate (Fine Arts, Music). With the advent of the ASC, these particular schools could still be available for occasional demonstration, but the state would not be paying the high salaries and overhead costs that could be put to better use in the classroom.

B. Accountability and Service Evaluation should be built into this proposed relationship between Area Service Centers and reimbursement schools.

1. Monitors...Institutions generally, and the present demonstration centers are no exception, are apt to be quite slow and stubborn when faced with major changes. An outside agency could monitor the change process and provide immediate feedback information to the Advisory Council about whether the present centers change to conform with new policies or just change the name of the game. (i.e., 5 centers may combine to produce one advertising brochure but still go their separate directions with their own budgets). A built in system of accountability which would compare the ASC's

with each other and against past results. If Area Service Centers are established, there should not be a 4 to 5 year time lapse with a combined cost of several million dollars, before their effectiveness is evaluated.

2. Service Evaluation...The gifted program has historically been able to provide little personal help to school people in evaluating their own programs. Some evaluation skills have been offered at a few summer institutes and workshops, but generally the teachers and administrators could not count on receiving assistance with their evaluation problems.

An evaluation group should be established which would have very specific responsibilities. First, it would be available to those ASC personnel and state staff who intend to incorporate sessions on evaluation into future institutes or workshops. Secondly, this agency would be available to work with any reimbursement school in the planning of its own evaluation. By planning is meant not only suggesting which measuring instrument to use, but also suggesting how evaluation can be incorporated into the objectives of the local program, i.e., minimum timelines for collecting data. By evaluation is not meant a research project but simply a pertinent plan related to the specific district which can tell the reimbursement personnel if they are doing anything significantly different and if so, how effective is their new approach. This evaluation group should also be charged with reviewing the purposes and approaches to educating the gifted. The value of programs as well as their articulation and comprehension should be weighed. It would be preferable to separate the monitoring and service evaluation units.

The above recommendations apply uniformly to all sections of the state including Chicago. The Chicago centers could well serve as the laboratory for developing gifted programs for minority groups in cities throughout Illinois.

These recommendations represent the considered judgment of the evaluation staff as to the best solution possible for maximizing the potential of demonstration centers given the present structure and limits of the Illinois Plan. However, such restructuring does not take into consideration the total Illinois Plan for the Gifted and more basic changes which might be made on a broader level. Recommendations of this nature will be included in a comprehensive final evaluation report on the total state plan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Clark, David L., Guba, Egon G. "An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education." Seminar on Innovation in Planning School Curriculum, October 1965.

2. Colton, David L. State Power and Local Decision Making in Education: A Case Study. Unpublished dissertation: College of Education, University of Chicago, 1968.

3. Colton, David L. Policies of the Illinois Plan for Program Development for Gifted Children. St. Louis, Missouri: Center for Educational Field Studies, Washington University, August 1968.

4. Eichholz, Gerhard C. "Why do Teachers Reject Change?" Theory into Practice, Vol. II, No. 5, December, 1963, pp. 264-268.

5. Erlandson, David A. An Examination of Decision Rules Within Organization Units as Responses to Government Stimuli. Unpublished dissertation: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1969.

6. Guba, Egon. "The Change Continuum and its Relation to the Illinois Plan for Program Development for Gifted Children." Paper presented at a conference on Educational Change, March 1966.

7. Havelock, Ronald G. et al. Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan July, 1969. (Chapter 11, p.5)

8. Horvat, John J. Content and Strategies of Communication in Current Educational Change Efforts. A presentation for the AASA - Educational Press Association discussion group on "Communication Strategies of Educational Change", February, 1967.

9. House, Ernest R. "Demonstration Center Visits Resulting in Action." Mimeo, Illinois Plan for Educational Leadership Development, 1966, 31 pages.

10. House, Ernest R. An Analysis of the Role of the Demonstration Director. Unpublished dissertation: College of Education, University of Illinois, 1967.

11. House, Ernest R., Kerins, Thomas, Lapan, Stephen, Steele, Joe M. The Visibility and Clarity of Demonstrations (Appendices) Northfield, Illinois: Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory Inc., June 1969.

12. House, Ernest R., Steele, Joe M., Kerins, Thomas. The Development of Educational Programs -- Advocacy in a Non-Rational System. Urbana, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, November, 1970.

13. Kerins, Thomas, House, Ernest R., Lapan, Stephen, Steele, Joe M. The Illinois Demonstration Centers -- The Visitors' View. Urbana, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, October 1969.

14. Kerins, Thomas, House, Ernest R., Lapan, Stephen, Steele, Joe M. After the Visit: The Impact of Demonstration. Urbana, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, May 1970.

15. Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. New York. The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, pp. 81-86.

16. Steele, Joe M., House, Ernest R., Lapan, Stephen, Kerins, Thomas. Instructional Climate in Illinois Gifted Classes. Urbana, Illinois: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, 1970.